

REMARKS / DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application; claims 14-20 are newly added.

The applicant thanks the Examiner for determining that the drawings are acceptable.

The Office action rejects claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph; claim 8 is correspondingly amended to correct a typographical error.

The Office action rejects claims 1-13 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) over Yu (USP 7,167,560). The applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Yu fails to teach a method that includes defining a distortion algorithm that is executable to generate a lower quality version of electronic content by a distortion of a high quality version of the electronic content, and distributing the higher quality version and the distortion algorithm, as claimed in claim 1, upon which claims 2-8 and 20 depend.

Yu fails to teach a medium that includes a high quality version of an electronic content and a distortion algorithm that is executable to generate a lower quality version of the electronic content by a distortion of the high quality version of the electronic content, as claimed in claim 7, upon which claim 8 depends.

Yu fails to teach a player that includes a decryption unit operable to decrypt and decode a high quality version of an electronic content and a distortion unit operable to generate a lower quality version of the electronic content by a distortion of the decrypted and decoded high quality version of the electronic content, as claimed in claim 9, upon which claims 10-19 depend.

The Office action asserts that Yu teaches a medium that includes a high quality version of electronic content and a distortion algorithm that is executable to generate a lower quality version of the electronic content by distorting the high quality content at column 3, lines 6-31, column 4, lines 27-47, column 7, lines 21-57, and column 10, lines 38-64. The Office action also asserts that this cited text teaches a player that includes a distortion unit that generates a lower quality version of the electronic content by distorting a decrypted and decoded high quality version of the electronic content. The applicant respectfully disagrees with these assertions.

Yu teaches a technique for providing a variety of versions of electronic content, each at different quality levels. As the Office action notes, Yu teaches "different quality levels of preview available to different types of users (e.g. lower level with least clear data preview for general population, higher level preview with clearer data for club members, and full playback for authorized or paid customers)" (Yu, column 3, lines 15-19). Yu provides these different quality levels by encrypting the different data/quality levels of the full-quality content using different encryption levels (Yu, column 3, lines 6-16). That is, Yu teaches a distribution of different encodings/encryptions of the content, and a player renders the appropriate quality level of the content based on the user's ability/authorization to decrypt the different data/quality levels. Each encryption of Yu's content corresponds to a distortion of the content, higher encryption levels corresponding to higher distortion levels; correspondingly, each decryption of a higher encryption level removes the distortion to provide a higher quality of the content:

"Where the encryption-caused disruption is slight, the recipient will only be aware of a slight degradation in the quality of the media. But where the encryption is more significant, there comes a degree of disruption at which the media is rendered substantially imperceptible or of such low quality as to be substantially unsuitable to the recipient." (Yu, column 4, lines 35-40.)

Yu distributes the content at a variety of quality (encryption) levels, and does not distribute means for generating the variety of quality levels, as claimed in each of the applicant's independent claims. Yu's player does not generate distorted versions of high-quality content; contrarily, Yu's player generates undistorted (decrypted) versions of distorted (encrypted) versions of the content. That is, Yu's player creates higher-quality (decrypted) content from lower-quality (encrypted) content.

Because Yu does not teach distributing a distortion algorithm that creates a lower quality level from a high quality version of the content, as specifically claimed in claim 1, and does not teach distributing such a distortion algorithm on an electronic medium or within a player, as specifically claimed in claims 7 and 9, respectively, the applicant respectfully requests the Examiner's reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1-13 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) over Yu.

In view of the foregoing, the applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the objection(s) and/or rejection(s) of record, allow all the pending claims, and find the application in condition for allowance. If any points remain in issue that may best be resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert M. McDermott/
Robert M. McDermott, Esq.
Reg. 41,508
804-493-0707

Please direct all correspondence to:
Corporate Counsel
U.S. PHILIPS CORPORATION
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001